



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,600	03/31/2008	James M. Brugger	T4342-14501US02	9019
181 7590 08/13/2010 MILES & STOCKBRIDGE PC 1751 PINNACLE DRIVE SUITE 500 MCLEAN, VA 22102-3833				
EXAMINER				
DEAK, LESLIE R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3761				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/13/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ipdocketing@milestockbridge.com
sstiles@milestockbridge.com

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	Application No. 10/578,600 Examiner LESLIE R. DEAK	Applicant(s) BRUGGER ET AL. <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Art Unit</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">3761</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> </table>	Art Unit		3761	
Art Unit						
3761						

All Participants:
 (1) LESLIE R. DEAK.
 (2) Mark Catan.

Status of Application: _____
 (3) _____.
 (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 9 August 2010 **Time:** _____

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:
1-18

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Leslie R. Deak/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3761

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner made a telephone restriction requirement between the pinching valve of claims 1-2 (embodiment shown in FIGS 5A, 5B), the pinching valve of claims 3-4 and 12-15 (embodiment shown in FIG 7), and claims 5-11, drawn to a valving apparatus with a controller that does not require any of the pinching action of the other embodiments. Examiner further indicated claims 1-2 to be allowable over the prior art since the prior art fails to disclose or suggest a ring-shaped valve as claimed by Applicant with a pivoting actuator that pinches flow paths to change flow direction, along with the other steps and limitations of the claims. Applicant's representative indicated election of claims 1-2 without travers and a desire to add claims drawn to the embodiment of claim 1. Examiner agreed to review claims submitted in a preliminary amendment and is awaiting such an amendment before acting on the case.